

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application. Reconsideration is now respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claims 22-39 are pending. Claims 22, 28, and 34 are independent claims. Claims 23, 29, 34, and 35 have been amended without prejudice herein. Claims 41 and 41 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that all amendments and new claims are supported by the specification as originally filed and that no new matter has been added.

Claims 34-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 22, 24, 28, 30, 34, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0036622 A1 (hereinafter “Dukach”) in further view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0162112 A1 (hereinafter “Javed”). Claims 23, 29, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dukach in further view of Javed in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,272,318 B1 (hereinafter “Yoshioka”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,061,477 B1 (hereinafter “Noguchi”) in further view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0158779 A1 (hereinafter “Ouyang”) and U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0063691 A1 (hereinafter “Shiozawa”). Claims 25, 31, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dukach in view of Javed in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,181,364 B1 (hereinafter “Ford”). Claims 26, 32, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dukach in view of Javed in further view of Ford in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,940,502 B2 (hereinafter “Lin”). Claims 27, 33, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dukach in view of Javed in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,259 (hereinafter “Perlman”). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.¹

¹ The following discussion identifies exemplary reference characters, and/or references particular portions of the disclosure. Such identification and/or references do not constitute a representation that any claim element is limited to the embodiment illustrated at any identified character or described in any referenced portion of the disclosure.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Claim Rejections

Claim 34 has been amended without prejudice to depend upon pending Claim 22 rather than cancelled Claim 1. Claim 34 is therefore not indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 35-39 are dependent upon amended Claim 34. Therefore, this amendment also removes the indefiniteness noted by Examiner in regards to Claims 35-39. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections of Claims 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Claim Rejections

Obviousness is a question of law that is evaluated based on underlying factual question about the level of skill in the art at the time the invention was made, the scope and content of the prior art, and the differences between the prior art and the asserted claim. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727 at 1734, 1745 (2007) (quoting *Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)). In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schneck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The cited references fail, in any combination, to render any of the pending claims unpatentably obvious when properly considered as a whole.²

The Examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon the prior art. *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1471-72, 223 USPQ 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Applicant may traverse the Examiner's *prima facie* determination as improperly made out. *In re Heldt*, 58 C.C.P.A. 701, 433 F.2d 808, 811, 167 USPQ 676, 678 (CCPA 1970). Applicant submits a *prima facie* case of obviousness is lacking, at least by virtue that the cited references fail, in any combination, to teach each of the limitations of any of the pending claims.

² The following discussion identifies exemplary reference characters, and/or references particular portions of the disclosure. Such identification and/or references do not constitute an admission that any claim element is limited to the embodiment illustrated at any identified character or described in any referenced portion of the disclosure.

Claims 22, 28, and 34

Applicants respectfully submit the embodiments specifically recited in independent Claims 22, 28, and 34—when considered as a whole—are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art taken alone or in combination with one another, also when considered as a whole. Particularly, the prior art does not teach or disclose in combination with the other disclosed elements and limitations: (1) “a real-time information display module for receiving real-time information transmitted via a wireless channel,” or (2) “a synchronous [transmitting/receiving] module for [transmitting/receiving] a synchronous control signal and controlling reproducing operation of said LCD display module”. *See, e.g., Claim 34.*

Claim 22, for example, recites:

A master transmitter used in a multimedia information releasing system, comprising:

a video source input module for decoding contents stored in a storage medium into video and audio signal;

a real-time information display module for receiving real-time information transmitted via a wireless channel;

a LCD display module coupled to said video source input module and said real-time information display module, for receiving and reproducing said video and audio signal and said real-time information;

a synchronous transmitting module for transmitting a synchronous control signal and controlling reproducing operation of said LCD display module; and

Claims 28 and 34 are similar. Consequently, Claims 22, 28, and 34 are not rendered obvious by any combination of prior art references.

For example, any combination of Dukach and Javed do not render the claims obvious for at least the following reasons. Dukach generally teaches a network of mobile outdoor display units having display screens wherein the geographic location of such units are sensed and that information is used to select which messages are shown on the mobile display screens. *See, Dukach, Abstract.* Javed generally teaches “systems and methods for the distribution of video

files via a public communications network” such as the Internet. *See, Javed, Technical Field of the Invention*. The present disclosure, in contrast, relates generally to a synchronized multimedia information wireless promulgating system for use in buildings. *See, Abstract*.

Specifically, Dukach discloses attaching a camera to a mobile outdoor display unit for “recording images for real-time display on the mobile unit’s display screens”. *Dukach, specification [0188]*. Thus, images being captured by the recording camera attached to the mobile unit are simultaneously displayed on the mobile display. Independently, the mobile unit of Dukach also includes a “local communications device” for communicating “with local communication devices of the same type that are relatively close to the mobile unit.” *Id. at [0189]*.

These separate elements of Dukach are not the same as the claimed **“real-time information display module for receiving real-time information transmitted via a wireless channel.”** *See, e.g., Claim 22*. In contrast, the alleged “real-time information,” *i.e.*, the image information simultaneously being captured by the camera on the mobile unit and displayed on the mobile display, is not—as claimed in the present application—received/transmitted “via a wireless channel.” *See id.* The mobile unit of Dukach merely includes a distinct “local communications device” such as a “radio-frequency wireless communication device[.]” *Dukach, specification [0189]*. When considered as a whole, the display of real-time images and the local communications device of Dukach are separate and unrelated. Dukach, therefore, fails to teach, or even suggest for that matter, a **“real-time information display module for receiving real-time information transmitted via a wireless channel,”** *See, e.g., Claim 22*.

Dukach also fails to teach or suggest a **“synchronous [transmitting/receiving] module”** as claimed in the present application. *See, e.g., Claim 22*. Dukach merely teaches “synchronizing displays between multiple different display units” as being (among other things) a function of distance between separate mobile display units. *Dukach, specification [0331]*. In contrast, the present disclosure does not condition synchronous display on the proximity of one receiver in relation to another. Moreover, Dukach, or any other reference for that matter, fails to disclose any synchronous transmitting/receiving module that **“[transmit/receives] a synchronous control signal and control[s] reproducing operation of said LCD display module”**. *See, e.g., Claim 22 (emphasis added)*. This entirety of this limitation was unaddressed in the in present

Office action. When considered as a whole, the alleged display synchronization disclosed in Dukach does not function as the synchronous transmitting module disclosed in the present application. Dukach or any other reference, therefore, fails to teach, or even suggest for that matter, *“a synchronous transmitting module for transmitting a synchronous control signal and controlling reproducing operation of said LCD display module.”* See, e.g., Claim 22.

Accordingly, since Dukach and Javed each, and also in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed *multimedia information releasing system* (and *master transmitter/slave receiver*) of independent Claims 22, 28, and 34; reconsideration and removal of the asserted rejections is specifically requested. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of Claims 23-27, 29-33, and 35-39 is also requested; at least by virtue of these Claims' ultimate dependency upon patentably distinct base Claims 22, 28, and 34.

For purposes of further prosecution, Applicants address some further rejections of dependent claims. Regarding Claims 24, 30, and 36, the Office action argues that “Javed further teaches ‘MCU control unit sending ... to IR emitting unit so that said IR emitting unit emits an infrared control signal outwards and ... transmits RF signal outwards.’” See, 9/29/2009 Office action, pg. 4. However, the claim limitations at issue read in full:

The master transmitter according to claim 22, said synchronous transmitting module comprising an infrared emitting unit, a MCU control unit, a RF synchronous transmitting unit, wherein said MCU control unit **simultaneously sending a high level trigger signal to said RF synchronous transmitting unit, and sending a level trigger signal to said IR emitting unit at a predetermined trigger time** so that said IR emitting unit emits an infrared control signal outwards and said RF synchronous transmitting unit transmits a RF signal outwards.

See, Claim 24 (*emphasis added*). The Office action failed to address at least the bold parts above; and therefore failed to address the claim as a whole.

In any event, “Javed teaches an IR repeater which converts the IR output from the viewer device 1390 to a RF and broadcasts it through the walls, and for certain devices converts the RF signal to IR commands to accommodate.” See, 9/29/2009 Office action, pg. 4. The present application, in contrast, *“simultaneously send[s] a high level trigger signal to said RF synchronous transmitting unit, and [] a level trigger signal to said IR emitting unit . . . so that*

said IR emitting unit emits an infrared control signal outwards and said RF synchronous transmitting unit transmits a RF signal outwards. See, e.g., *Claim 24*. Thus, the IR signal and RF signal are emitted/transmitted simultaneously; not in a relay fashion as Javed discloses. See Javed, *specification* [0086] (“*IR repeater . . . converts the IR output . . . to a radio frequency (RF) and broadcasts it through walls . . . to IR repeater*”). Javed, therefore, fails to teach, or even suggest for that matter, the relevant limitations of Claims 24, 30, and 36.

Regarding Claims 23, 29, and 35, the Office action argues that a combination of disparate references could be obviously pieced together to render the Claims 23, 29, and 35 invalid for obviousness. However, “[o]bviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, *absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination.*” *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Thus, the mere fact that references might be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious, unless the prior art or other contemporaneous evidence suggests the desirability of the combination.

Applicants respectfully traverse because the cited motivations are legally insufficient. For example, the action asserts that combining Dukach in view of Javed in further view of Yoshioka would be motivated “in order to have a pager capable of setting a plurality of transmission speeds”. See, *9/29/2009 Office action*, pg. 5. However, the Claims of the present invention are directed to a “multimedia information releasing system,” not a pager; let alone a pager with a plurality of transmission speeds. See, e.g., *Claim 34*. Indeed, the Yoshioka reference itself discloses a pager that “automatically sets operation of the decoder to either one of a plurality of transmission speeds of the received signal”. See, *Yoshioka, abstract*. Thus, the proffered motivation to *combine* the cited references is inadequate because it merely refers to and repeats an irrelevant motivation related solely to the Yoshioka reference.

Accordingly, as the cited references each, and also in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the recited *multimedia information releasing system* (and *master transmitter/slave receiver*) of Claims 22-39. Reconsideration and removal of the asserted rejections is specifically requested.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 13836-00004-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Wayne C. Jaeschke/
Wayne C. Jaeschke
Registration No.: 21,062
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants